

THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOSE LUIS PACHECO CASTILLO and  
LEYSLI VANESSA ROJAS GONZALEZ,

Defendants.

CASE NO. CR24-0212-JCC

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Defendant Leysli Vanessa Rojas Gonzalez's unopposed motion to continue trial (Dkt. No. 36), which the Court GRANTS for the reasons explained below.

On November 6, 2024, a grand jury indicted Jose Luis Pacheco Castillo and Ms. Gonzalez for knowingly and intentionally possessing with the intent to distribute methamphetamine and fentanyl. (Dkt. No. 24 at 1–2.) On November 14, 2024, the Honorable Michelle L. Peterson, U.S. Magistrate Judge, entered a plea of not guilty as to Mr. Castillo's offense and set a trial for January 6, 2025. (*See* Dkt. No. 30.) On November 21, 2024, the Honorable Brian A. Tsuchida, U.S. Magistrate Judge, did the same for Ms. Gonzalez. (*See* Dkt. No. 31.)

Ms. Gonzalez now requests that trial be continued to June 16, 2025. (*See* Dkt. No. 36.)

Her counsel asserts that additional time is needed to review discovery materials, investigate facts, evaluate public defenses, advise Ms. Gonzalez of the same, and prepare pretrial motions. (*Id.*) Both Mr. Castillo and Ms. Gonzalez have executed speedy trial waivers to July 16, 2025. (*See* Dkt. Nos. 34, 35.) Further, Ms. Gonzalez's counsel represents that Mr. Castillo does not oppose the continuance. (*See* Dkt. No. 36 at 2.) Based on the this, the Court FINDS as follows:

1. The failure to grant a continuance would deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv), and would result in a miscarriage of justice within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).
2. Granting a continuance will serve the ends of justice, as it is necessary to ensure adequate time for case preparation, and the ends of justice served outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A).
3. Given the minimal prejudice of delay to Mr. Castillo, the additional time requested by Ms. Gonzalez is a reasonable period of delay. 18 U.S.C § 3161(h)(6); *see United States v. Messer*, 197 F.3d 330, 337 (9th Cir. 1999).

Accordingly, the Court GRANTS the motion to continue (Dkt. No. 36). Trial is CONTINUED to June 16, 2025, at 9:30 a.m. The Court ORDERS that the time between the date of this order and the new trial date is excludable time under the Speedy Trial Act. The parties are DIRECTED to file pretrial motions no later than May 5, 2025.

DATED this 13th day of December 2024.



John C. Coughenour  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE